

University of Dundee

Falls research

Clark, Clare L.; McMurdo, Marion E. T.; Witham, Miles D.

Published in:
Age and Ageing

DOI:
[10.1093/ageing/afv047](https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afv047)

Publication date:
2015

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Clark, C. L., McMurdo, M. E. T., & Witham, M. D. (2015). Falls research: stumbling or striding? *Age and Ageing*, 44(3), 350-352. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afv047>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Falls research – stumbling or striding?

Clare L Clark PhD

Marion E T McMurdo MD

Miles D Witham PhD

Ageing and Health, Medical Research Institute, University of Dundee, Ninewells Hospital, Dundee

DD1 9SY. Tel: 01382 383086

Correspondence to Dr Witham. Email: m.witham@dundee.ac.uk

Word count: 1020

References: 8

Falls remain a major cause of morbidity in older people, leading to hospitalisation, injury, dependency and death in too many. Several interventions have been shown to reduce fall rates in older people [1], but there is a major gap between what we know from trials and what is often achieved in practice. Strength and balance training for the lower limbs (either via Tai-Chi or tailored programmes) is known to be effective, but is challenging to implement in practice; take-up rates are suboptimal, programmes are expensive and labour-intensive, with high discontinuation rates [2]. Worse still, many existing multifactorial interventions are delivered through costly falls clinics, which employ large numbers of highly-trained healthcare staff but yet can see only a fraction of the 30% of over-65's that fall each year.

These problems argue for a different approach if we are to impact falls rates on a population level; less expensive, less labour-intensive, shorter interventions are required if we are to increase reach. Unfortunately, such approaches have strayed from the existing evidence base, either because of an absence of evidence (e.g. slipper exchange programmes), or evidence of ineffectiveness (e.g. seated exercise [3]). This failure to implement evidence-based falls interventions is likely to at best waste resources for no effect, and at worst might be harmful, either by increasing falls rates or worsening other health outcomes, or by diverting resources away from areas where they would be more effectively deployed.

Continued efforts to test falls interventions and build a better evidence base are therefore important. The trial by xxx et al [4] of walking therapy tests a simple, inexpensive intervention, with the ability to scale to population level. The trial was large by the standards of many falls intervention trials, and used a follow up of nearly a year. A further point of merit is the focus on maintaining activity and independence utilised in this trial; many older people dislike engaging with services labelled as 'falls

services' [5] and hence a focus on positive health messages (activity) rather than negative messages (avoiding falls) is potentially valuable.

The trial did not show a reduction in falls – the primary aim of the trial. Although the trial was likely underpowered due to lower than expected recruitment and low falls rates, the lack of effect is consistent with previous evidence; previous reviews [6] suggest that walking programmes do not reduce the risk of falls. This is unsurprising; walking improves cardiorespiratory function and endurance, but does not improve either lower limb muscle strength or balance – the two key targets of effective physical therapy for falls reduction. Furthermore, falls rates are the product of both falls risk and falls opportunity. The danger is that by failing to reduce falls risk, but increasing falls opportunity, walking programmes might actually increase falls rates. This has been seen in at least one other trial of walking [7], and a signal in this direction was seen in the older subgroup in the current trial.

The key secondary finding from the trial was that self-reported physical activity rates in the intervention group were significantly increased. However, caution is warranted here. This outcome was not blinded (both the investigator and the participants knew the allocation group). Perhaps more importantly, we know that measuring physical activity via subjective measures is notoriously unreliable [8]. Objective Physical Activity (PA) measures, e.g. using triaxial accelerometry, can overcome such limitations of self-report measures and should be regarded as the research standard in this area. Subjective measures including the Incidental and Planned Exercise Questionnaire (IPEQ), whilst easy to administer, are also incapable of capturing the complexity of free-living daily activity patterns as they occur in people's everyday lives.

So what lessons should we draw from the results of this trial? Firstly, to remind ourselves that not all interventions to reduce falls are effective. The evidence is now clear that walking alone as an

intervention is not effective, and might actually be harmful if falls reduction is the aim. Falls programmes need to be evidence based, and that means abandoning ineffective interventions. Secondly, physical activity programmes need to measure falls as a measure of potential harm. Programmes to enhance everyday physical activity levels, especially in the oldest, most frail population, need to incorporate strength and balance training, preferably as an integral part of everyday functional activities that are most meaningful to the person, (i.e. sit to stand transfers instead of isolated, single muscle exercises). We need to motivate older adults to improve strength and balance using everyday activities that are functionally relevant and related to the goal of maintenance of physical independence, rather than attempting to sell such programmes on the goal of reducing falls. Such an approach would mitigate any increase in falls rates driven by increased opportunities to fall as activity levels increase, as well as avoiding the negative connotations of falls reduction. Thirdly, objective measurement of physical activity in intervention trials, both for falls research and activity interventions, should be the norm. The technology now available makes this eminently feasible in trials of up to several hundred participants, and such measures are essential if practitioners are to have confidence in the results.

Finally, there is a need for more innovative thinking in falls research. The current focus on exercise interventions to reduce falls has held centre stage for over 30 years, and too many current investigations aim to simply repackage existing exercise training programmes. Such programmes are unlikely to revolutionise the field, do not reach those who are unwilling or unable to exercise, and only reduce risk by a moderate amount even when implemented successfully. We suggest that to avoid stagnation, much more attention needs to be paid to alternative strategies – particularly to cognitive interventions (for instance dual task training) and to pharmacological interventions. We should be targeting sedentary behaviour by promoting the use of free-living physical activities as ‘exercises’ to improve strength and balance, as opposed to structured exercise programmes which lack popularity. A real opportunity for progress exists here, at the nexus between falls research and sarcopenia

research; only by embracing and evaluating interventions outwith traditional exercise programmes will we convert our current stumbles into strides of progress.

References:

- [1] Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Gillespie WJ, Sherrington C, Gates S, Clemson LM, Lamb SE. Interventions for preventing falls in older people living in the community. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012 Sep 12;9:CD007146
- [2] Bunn F, Barnet-Page E, McInnes E, Dickinson A, Horton K. A systematic review of older people's perceptions of facilitators and barriers to participation in falls-prevention interventions. Ageing Soc 2008;28:449-72.
- [3] McMurdo ME, Millar AM, Daly F. A randomized controlled trial of fall prevention strategies in old peoples' homes. Gerontology 2000; 46: 83-7.
- [4] Trial to which this editorial refers
- [5] Yardley L, Donovan-Hall M, Francis K, Todd C. Older people's views of advice about falls prevention: a qualitative study. Health Ed Res 2006;21:508-17
- [6] Sherrington C, Whitney JC, Lord SR et al. Effective exercise for the prevention of falls: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Am Geriatr Soc 2008;56:2234–2243.
- [7] Ebrahim S, Thompson PW, Baskaran V, et al. Randomized placebo-controlled trial of brisk walking in the prevention of postmenopausal osteoporosis. Age Ageing 1997;26:253-260.
- [8] Hallal PC, Anderson LB, Bull FC, Guthold R, Haskell W, Ekelund U. Global physical activity levels: surveillance progress, pitfalls and prospects. Lancet 2012; 380:247-257